

pending before the court, so the court has authority to stay his state-ordered execution.¹

Respondents do not oppose Woods's motion. ECF No. 36 at 2, 13, 16. Having reviewed the motion and relevant authority, the court finds a stay is warranted in this case and **GRANTS** Woods's motion for stay of execution, ECF No. 30.

While Respondents do not oppose Woods's request to stay his execution, the parties appear to disagree as to when the statute of limitations runs and, consequently, when Woods must file his final petition. In order to decide this issue, the court needs a clear statement of each party's position and directs both parties to provide additional briefing on the statute of limitations in this case by July 15, 2018.

In addition, the court denies Respondents' request to brief the placeholder petition. Once Woods files his final petition, the court will issue a scheduling order.

AND IT IS SO ORDERED.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'D. Norton', written over a horizontal line.

DAVID C. NORTON
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

May 10, 2018
Charleston, South Carolina

¹ The court notes that, according to the parties, the state has not yet set an execution date for Woods.